

## REMARKS

Applicant submits this response to the Office Action mailed December 19, 2007.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the application.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-16 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 7-12 have been amended to address this rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 1-16 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph is overcome.

Replacement Figures 1-3 are attached herein as Appendix A. The replacement figures merely remove shading to ensure sufficient clarity for scanning. The replacement figures contain no new matter.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by French Patent No. 2,825,082 to Yves et al. The Office Action rejects Claims 1-4, 10-11, and 14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent No. 903,288 to Ikuo et al. in view of Yves. (Note: the Office Action actually states that these claims are rejected over Ikuo in view of Canadian Patent No. 285,082 to Yves et al., but Applicant believes that the Office Action intended to mean French Patent No. 2,825,082 to Yves et al.) The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3, 7-13, and 16 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,273,015 to Motsenbocker.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite a hybrid propulsion system having energy collectors and energy stores adapted for utilising at least solar energy, wave or water current energy, and wind energy. None of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest a propulsion system adapted to use wave or water current energy, and particularly wave or water current energy in combination with solar and wind energy. As amended Claim 1 recites that a vehicle adapted to use solar, wind, and wave or water current energy, amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Since Claims 2-22 depend from independent Claim 1, these dependent claims are also patentably distinct from the cited references for at least the reason described above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 1-16 is overcome and that newly added Claims 17-22 are patentable.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2127.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/10/08



---

Brian J. Teague  
Reg. No. 55,670

THOMAS & RARING, P.C.  
536 Granite Avenue  
Richmond, Virginia 23226  
Phone: (804) 344-8130  
Fax: (804) 644-3643  
E-Mail: info@ip-counsel.net

## APPENDIX A